## REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on November 24, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

**Present Status of the Application**

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it refers to purported merits of the invention and is not a concise statement of the technical disclosure. The specification and claim 9 are objected to because of informalities.

The Office Action rejects all the presently pending claims 1-16. Specifically, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. (US Pat. No. 5,930,295, "Isley, Jr. et al." hereinafter) in view of Robinson et al. (US Pat. No. 5,943,290, "Robinson et al." hereinafter). The Office Action further rejects claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Hoobler (US Pat. No. 7,130,337 B2, "Hoobler" hereinafter). The Office Action further rejects claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Sorrels et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0013177 A1, "Sorrels et al." hereinafter).



PAGE 10/14 * RCVD AT 2/16/2007 8:39:07 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/41 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:949 6600809 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-36

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In response thereto, Applicants have amended the abstract, the specification, and claim 9 to overcome the objections. Claims 1 and 9 are further amended to more clearly define the present invention. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-16 remain pending in the present invention, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

*Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Hoobler. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Sorrels et al.*

Applicants respectfully traverse the above-identified rejections for the reason provided hereinafter.

(1) *Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al.*

The Examiner admits that Isley, Jr. et al. does not disclose a first ground reference and a joint clock source (page 4, lines 1-2 of the Office Action), and asserts that figure 4 of Robinson et al. discloses a clocking generator which directly produces both the analog signal and the digital



PAGE 11/14 * RCVD AT 2/16/2007 8:39:07 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/41 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:949 6600809 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-36

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

clocking signal.

In para [0006], lines 9-10 of page 5 of the Applicants' invention, it is emphasized that "[m]ost importantly, a ground of the joint clock source is connected to the first ground reference." In para [0021], lines 10-13 of page 11, it is described that "[c]onventionally, a ground reference of the crystal oscillator 350 is connected at the digital ground 370, and un-anticipatively creates some unpredictable interference among the circuit elements in the TDD transceiver." Said features are further evidenced in figure 3 of the present invention which demonstrates that the crystal oscillator 350 is connected to the analog ground reference 360 referred to as the first ground reference as claimed. Applicant asserts that the structure taught by Robinson et al. is distinct and actually irrelevant with the claimed invention. In comparison with the present application, Robinson shows the external source from the crystal oscillator passing through clock generator process to produce the analog clocking and digital clocking signal as illustrated in Fig. 4 of pat 290'. Robinson et al. merely teach those analog and digital clocking signal eventually will connect to AGND and DGND. **That is not the reference of joint clock connect to AGND and DGND.** In other words, all cited prior art taken individually or in-combination still failed to teach "***connecting a ground reference of the joint clock source directly to the first ground reference***", as amended in the Applicants' claim 1.

For the foregoing reason, if the independent claims 1 and 9 should be allowed over prior art of record, their respective dependent claims 2, 4-5, 7-8 and 10, 12-13, 15-16 should also be allowed as a matter of law, because the dependent claims contain all features of their independent claims 1 and 9. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).



PAGE 12/14 * RCVD AT 2/16/2007 8:39:07 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/41 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:949 6600809 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-36

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

(2) *Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Hoobler.*

For the foregoing reason, if the non-obvious independent claims 1 and 9 should be allowed over prior art of record, their respective dependent claims 3 and 11 should also be allowed as a matter of law, because the dependent claims 3 and 11 contain all features of their independent claims 1 and 9. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

(3) *Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Robinson et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Sorrels et al.*

For the foregoing reason, if the non-obvious independent claims 1 and 9 should be allowed over prior art of record, their respective dependent claims 6 and 14 should also be allowed as a matter of law, because the dependent claims 6 and 14 contain all features of their independent claims 1 and 9. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).



PAGE 13/14 * RCVD AT 2/16/2007 8:39:07 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/41 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:949 6600809 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-36

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reason, it is believed that the pending claims 1-16 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such an effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 2/16/2007

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809



PAGE 14/14 * RCVD AT 2/16/2007 8:39:07 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/41 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:949 6600809 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-36

BEST AVAILABLE COPY